



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,257	08/06/2001	Eun Seog Lee	MR2685-94	7943

7590 05/04/2005

Rosenberg Klein & Lee
3458 Ellicott Center Drive Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/890,257	Applicant(s) LEE, EUN S.	
	Examiner Jeffrey D. Popham	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because:
 - Figure 3 labels the web server as 21, while the specification refers to the web server as label 32.
 - Figure 4 contains labels S15 and S61, which are not contained in the specification.
 - In figure 4, "serch" should be "search", "divice" should be "device", "is security code requested for?" should be "is security code requested?".
 - Figure 4 should clearly state when to take each path, such as by marking each path coming from a question with the answer to that question.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and

informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. A substitute specification including the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because the specification contains numerous misspellings and unclear sentences, such as the following:

- Throughout the spec, “advertises” is used as a noun, which should be “advertisements”.
- Page 1, line 25: “connected by a client” should be “connected to a client”.
- Page 2, line 1: “a server dedicated system” should be “a dedicated server system”.
- Page 2, line 17: “for pay or free” should be “either for a fee or for free”.
- Page 4, line 8: “should use particular monitor” should be “should use a particular monitor”.
- Page 7, line 6: “series of device automatic settings” should be “series of automatic device settings”.
- Page 7, line 15: “what are installed” should be “what is installed”.
- Page 11, lines 7-9: It is unclear what this sentence means, because of the excerpt “in order to a security of the double monitor”.
- Page 12, line 17: “FIG. 5” should be “FIG. 4”.

- Page 14, line 25: "security code 19d is requested for" should be "security code 19d is requested".
- Page 15, lines 25-26: "provided from the system server" should be "provided by the system server".

A substitute specification must not contain new matter. The substitute specification must be submitted with markings showing all the changes relative to the immediate prior version of the specification of record. The text of any added subject matter must be shown by underlining the added text. The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters. The text of any deleted subject matter must be shown by being placed within double brackets if strike-through cannot be easily perceived. An accompanying clean version (without markings) and a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter must also be supplied. Numbering the paragraphs of the specification of record is not considered a change that must be shown.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3-6 and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) because of the following informalities:

- Throughout the claims, "advertises" is used as a noun, which should be "advertisements".

Art Unit: 2137

- Claim 3, line 8; and claim 6, line 3 recite the limitation "the double monitor".

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, "the double monitor" has been construed as "a double monitor".

- Claim 3, line 10 recites the limitation "the settings". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, "the settings" has been construed as "settings".

- Claim 4, lines 9-10 recites the limitation "the information of the system".

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, "the information of the system" has been construed as "information of the system".

- Claim 5, line 3; and claim 9, line 3: "monitor which" should be "monitor on which".

- Claim 6, line 2 recites the limitation "said plug and play data". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, claim 6 has been construed as being dependent upon claim 2, since claim 2 is the only claim that recites "plug and play data".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2137

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodwin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,812,819) for the reasons given in the international search report.

5. Claims 1, 4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Challener et al. (U.S. Patent 6,654,886).

Regarding Claim 1,

Challener et al. disclose an authentication system for connection to a particular information providing server using a dedicated system, the authentication system comprising:

At least one user computer connected to the Internet, for generating a registration code for authenticating the user computer necessary for a log-in process in order to receive information having a particular format (Column 3, lines 7-13); and

A system server which receives the registration code of the user computer and ascertains whether or not the user computer is registered,

in the case that the system server is accessed by the user computer via the Internet (Column 3, lines 7-13).

Regarding Claim 4,

Challener et al. disclose that the system server generates the registration code for authenticating the user computer if the user computer is turned on, requests the user computer connected to the system server to send the registration code to ascertain whether the user computer is a dedicated system which can use the contents of the system server if the user computer is connected to the Internet and accesses the system server providing particular information, and provides information of the system server after ascertaining whether the user computer adopts the dedicated system which can use the information of the system server (Column 6, lines 25-49).

Regarding Claim 7,

Claim 7 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challener et al. in view of Beyda (U.S. Patent 5,870,610).

Regarding Claim 2,

Challener et al. disclose that the registration code generated in the user computer further comprises a product number and a security code (Column 3, lines 14-19), but do not disclose that this data is used as plug and play data which is used in order to automatically install a driver for each device of the user computer.

Beyda, however, discloses that data associated with the hardware is used as plug and play data which is used in order to automatically install a driver for each device of the user computer (Column 3, lines 30-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the automatic configuration system of Beyda into the service providing system of Challener et al. in order to provide a system that requires no human interaction in order to install and update drivers for new devices or operating systems (Column 2, lines 26-44).

Regarding Claim 6,

Challener et al. disclose that the plug and play data used as the registration code uses plug and play data of a double monitor in the user computer (Column 3, lines 14-19).

Regarding Claim 8,

Challener et al. disclose that the registration code further comprises a product number and a security code (Column 3, lines 14-19), but do not disclose that this data is used as plug and play data which is used in order to automatically install a driver for each device of the user computer.

Beyda, however, discloses that data associated with the hardware is used as plug and play data which is used in order to automatically install a driver for each device of the user computer (Column 3, lines 30-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the automatic configuration system of Beyda into the service providing system of Challener et al. in order to provide a system that requires no human interaction in order to install and update drivers for new devices or operating systems (Column 2, lines 26-44).

7. Claims 3, 5, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challener et al. in view of Van Hoff et al. (U.S. Patent 5,959,623).

Regarding Claim 3,

Challener et al. disclose that the system server comprises:

A member DB storing data of a plurality of users (Column 2, line 63 to Column 3, line 13);

A member management server for performing member registration and management via the member DB (Column 2, line 63 to Column 3, line 13);

A home page DB storing data necessary for operation of the home page of the system server (Column 3, lines 20-23); and

A web server connecting the system server to the Internet and managing the home page of the system server (Column 3, lines 20-23).

Challener et al. do not disclose an advertising DB storing advertising data or an advertising server for managing the advertisements.

Van Hoff et al., however, disclose an advertising DB storing advertising data displayed on an auxiliary screen of a double monitor; and an advertising server for managing the advertisements displayed on the double monitor according to settings of an operator of the system server (Column 3, lines 51-62 and Column 6, lines 37-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the advertisement display system of Van Hoff et al. into the service providing system of Challener et al. in order to allow a user to control the timing and content of advertisements he views (Column 1, lines 64-67).

Regarding Claim 5,

Challener et al. do not disclose that the user computer uses a double monitor including a main screen monitor on which main contents

processing by a user program are displayed and an auxiliary screen monitor on which a user environment indication and media indication of the user computer, a link (banner) linking web pages, and advertisements are displayed.

Van Hoff et al., however, disclose that the user computer uses a double monitor including a main screen monitor on which main contents processing by a user program are displayed and an auxiliary screen monitor on which a user environment indication and media indication of the user computer, a link (banner) linking web pages, and advertisements are displayed (Column 5, lines 3-27 and Column 6, lines 37-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the advertisement display system of Van Hoff et al. into the service providing system of Challener et al. in order to allow a user to control the timing and content of advertisements he views (Column 1, lines 64-67).

Regarding Claim 9,

Challener et al. do not disclose that the user computer uses a double monitor including a main screen monitor on which main contents processed by a user program are displayed and an auxiliary screen monitor on which a use environment indication and media indication of the user computer, a link (banner) linking web pages, and advertisements are displayed.

Van Hoff et al., however, disclose that the user computer uses a double monitor including a main screen monitor on which main contents processed by a user program are displayed and an auxiliary screen monitor on which a use environment indication and media indication of the user computer, a link (banner) linking web pages, and advertisements are displayed (Column 5, lines 3-27 and Column 6, lines 37-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the advertisement display system of Van Hoff et al. into the service providing system of Challener et al. in order to allow a user to control the timing and content of advertisements he views (Column 1, lines 64-67).

Regarding Claim 11,

Challener et al. disclose that the system server further comprises an authentication code DB storing authentication codes for the user computers, and a system authentication server for managing the system authentication of the user computers (Column 6, lines 16-24).

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challener et al. in view of French et al. (U.S. Patent 6,263,447).

Challener et al. disclose that the information provided via the system server can be completely used in the case that a dedicated system is used, in the step of providing information of the system server after ascertaining whether the

dedicated system capable of using the system server information is adopted in the user computer (Column 6, lines 25-49), but do not disclose that the information can be restrictively used if the user computer does not adopt the dedicated system.

French et al., however, disclose that the information can be restrictively used if the user computer does not adopt the dedicated system (Column 12, lines 14-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the access-level authentication method of French et al. into the service providing system of Challener et al. in order to provide a strong authentication protocol that protects the system from unauthorized users gaining access to private information by allowing the system to reject an access attempt or require more authentication data when the user's input data is suspicious (Column 2, lines 12-22).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Caldwell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "A" and "C".

**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**